

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-18 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his restriction requirement in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth hereinbelow.

The Examiners attention is drawn to the remarks of the previous Response filed on May 20, 2006.

As discussed in the previous response, it is respectfully submitted that the present application does include claims that are so linked as to form a single general inventive concept as set forth in PCT Rule 13.1. The Examiner contends that there is a lack of unity of invention stating that a single allowable generic concept has yet to be determined. It is respectfully submitted that this contention is not believed to be tenable in view of the fact that this is not a proper reason for an election of species. The claims are linked to be directed to one invention relating to a lock and key arrangement. The fact that the claims are linked was confirmed in the International Search Report wherein all of the claims were maintained in a single application. Thus, claims 1-18 should be considered in a single application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his election of species requirement.

### ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

The grouping of the claims in the previous Response filed on May 20, 2006 was incorrect. The corrected grouping of the claims is set forth as follows:

<u>GROUP</u>	<u>FIGURES</u>	<u>CLAIMS</u>
I	1-5	1-6, 9-14 and 17 (all generic claims)
II	6a and 6b	8 and 15
III	7 and 10	7 and 16
IV	8 and 9	
V	11-13	18
VI	14-16	

In the previous Reply claims 7 and 16 were incorrectly included in the elected group I.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17 are generic to the six species identified above. Applicant elected the species of Group I for initial examination. In view of the amendment to the grouping of the claims as set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner should review claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his election of species requirement and act on all of the claims in the present application. If the Examiner does persist in his election of species requirement, Applicant reserves the right to file divisional applications directed to the non-elected claims at a later date if they so desire.

Application No. 10/500,729  
Supplemental Response Dated June 16, 2006  
Office Action Dated March 27, 2006


Attorney Docket No. 0091-0239PUS1  
Art Unit 3676  
Page 14 of 14

Favorable action on the present application is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to  
Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
James M. Slattery  
Reg. No. 28,380

JMS/aw/mmi/ljr  
(703) 205-8000

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747